

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
6

7 LEE MURRAY SYKES, )  
8 Petitioner, ) 2:10-cv-00494-GMN-LRL  
9 vs. )  
10 ANTHONY SCILLIA, et al., ) ORDER  
11 Respondents. )  
12 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
13

14 Before the Court is Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 24).  
15 Respondents filed a Response (ECF No. 25) and Petitioner has not replied.

16 Having considered the motion and related briefing, and for the reasons set forth in the  
17 Respondents' opposition, the Court finds that reconsideration is not warranted as Petitioner  
18 offers nothing new to establish the Court's review and conclusions were erroneous. *See*  
19 *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir.  
20 1993). The Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 24) is **DENIED**.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED** this 14th day of April, 2011.

22  
23   
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Gloria M. Navarro  
26 United States District Judge